## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

No. 1:11-cr-10165-RGS

Vs.

August 23, 2011

11:00 a.m.

Defendants.

## RULE 11 HEARING

BEFORE: THE HONORABLE RICHARD G. STEARNS UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

John Joseph Moakley United States Courthouse 1 Courthouse Way, Courtroom No. 21 Boston, MA 02210

Helana E. Kline, RMR, CRR
Official Court Reporter

John Joseph Moakley United States Courthouse
1 Courthouse Way, Room 5209

Boston, MA 02210

## APPEARANCES:

For the Government:

United States Attorney's Office (By: Rachel S. Rollins, Assistant U.S. Attorney) John Joseph Moakley United States Courthouse 1 Courthouse Way, Suite 9200 Boston, Massachusetts 02210 617-748-3398

For the Defendant:

Law Office of James Budreau (By: James H. Budreau, Attorney at Law) 20 Park Plaza, Suite 1405 Boston, Massachusetts 02116 617-338-5587

## PROCEEDINGS

2.5

THE CLERK: All rise. All persons having business before the Honorable Richard G. Stearns, United States

District Judge, now sitting at Boston within and for the District of Massachusetts, may draw near, give their attendance, and they shall be heard. God save the United States of America and this Honorable Court. Court is open. Please be seated.

The case before this Court carries Case No. 11-cr-10165, United States of America versus Timothy Correia. Counsel, please identify yourselves for the record?

MS. ROLLINS: Good morning, your Honor. Rachel Rollins for the government.

MR. BUDREAU: And, your Honor, James Budreau on behalf of Mr. Correia. Good morning.

THE COURT: Good morning. Mr. Budreau, I gathered from the clerk that your client is offering to plead guilty to the one-count indictment; there is no plea agreement?

MR. BUDREAU: Correct, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.

THE CLERK: Mr. Correia, Count 1 of the indictment filed by the United States Attorney charges you with dealing in firearms without a license on or about July 13, 2010, and November 29th, 2010, in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 922A1(a), to which count you

1 previously plead not quilty. Do you now wish to change 2 your plea? 3 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. THE CLERK: And how do you plead to Count 1, quilty 4 5 or not quilty? 6 THE DEFENDANT: Guilty. 7 THE CLERK: Please raise your right hand. 8 (Timothy Correia duly sworn.) 9 THE CLERK: Would you please take a seat in the witness box. Counsel, would you join him please? 10 11 MR. BUDREAU: Yes. 12 THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. Correia. My name 13 is Richard Stearns; and as is evident, I'm a judge of the United States District Court. Before I can accept your plea 14 15 in the case I'm going to ask some questions. 16 The reason for the questions is that I have to make my 17 own determination that your decision to plead quilty is a 18 voluntary decision and one made with the full knowledge of 19 the consequences of pleading guilty. 20 Now, anything I say that is confusing or seems imprecise 21 either ask me to rephrase it or feel free to consult with 22 your lawyer before you answer. Okay? 23 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 24 THE COURT: Okay. For the record, can you tell us 2.5 your full name?

```
1
               THE DEFENDANT: Timothy Correia.
 2
               THE COURT: How old are you, Mr. Correia?
               THE DEFENDANT:
                               19.
               THE COURT: 19. Where were you born?
 4
               THE DEFENDANT: Brockton.
 5
               THE COURT: I'm sorry?
 6
 7
                               Brockton, Massachusetts.
               THE DEFENDANT:
 8
               THE COURT: In Brockton, and you grew up in Brockton?
 9
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.
10
               THE COURT: All right. Did you attend school in
11
      Brockton?
12
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.
13
               THE COURT: How far did you go?
14
               THE DEFENDANT: I went to 11th grade.
15
               THE COURT: So you went to Brockton High School?
16
               THE DEFENDANT: I went to Brockton High School.
17
               THE COURT: And you left during or at the end of the
18
       11th grade?
19
               THE DEFENDANT: It was like during. It was during
20
      the year.
21
               THE COURT: During the year?
22
               THE DEFENDANT:
                              Yeah.
23
               THE COURT: Do you have your GED?
24
               THE DEFENDANT: No, sir.
2.5
               THE COURT: No. When you left school, what did you
```

```
1
       do?
 2
               THE DEFENDANT:
                               Nothing.
               THE COURT: Did you work?
               THE DEFENDANT:
                               No.
 4
 5
               THE COURT: Not really. Are you married?
               THE DEFENDANT: No, sir.
 6
               THE COURT: Do you have children?
               THE DEFENDANT: No, sir.
 9
               THE COURT: Is your family in Brockton?
10
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.
11
               THE COURT: Brothers, sisters?
12
               THE DEFENDANT:
                               I have four sisters and two brothers.
13
               THE COURT: So it's a big family?
14
               THE DEFENDANT: Right.
15
               THE COURT: So do you have any trade or profession?
16
               THE DEFENDANT: No, sir.
17
               THE COURT:
                           This question I'm not asking to be
18
       intrusive, I'm required to ask it: have you ever been
19
       treated for any mental condition or psychological problem?
20
               THE DEFENDANT: No, sir.
21
               THE COURT: Are you presently taking any prescription
22
      medication?
23
               THE DEFENDANT: No, sir.
24
               THE COURT: So as far as you're concerned as you
25
       sit here, your mind is clear, you understand the nature of
```

the proceeding?

2.5

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: All right. This document is called an indictment. An indictment is itself not evidence of a crime. It simply notice to the person named in the indictment that he must answer to the charge that the indictment sets out.

Okay.

Have you read the indictment?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Have you discussed it with Mr. Budreau?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Has he explained to you the elements of the offense charged? By "elements" a lawyer would mean the critical components of the offense that the government would have to prove beyond a reasonable doubt to obtain a conviction.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay, and Let me be very brief.

Essentially, what the indictment charges is that during a period between July and November of 2010, that is last year, you engaged in the business of dealing which usually means selling or transferring the possession of a firearm to someone else without being authorized to do so by law.

To be authorized by law one has to be licensed as a firearms dealer. The indictment alleges that you did not

1 have a license. Nonetheless, the firearms that were dealt 2 with, which were seven in number, and they're specified in 3 the indictment, were all transferred to another's 4 possession, again, without a license to do so. 5 Do you understand that that's what the charge is? 6 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 7 THE COURT: Now, let me ask the prosecutor what the 8 maximum penalties for the offense are? 9 MS. ROLLINS: Yes, your Honor. There's a five-year 10 maximum prison sentence, a fine of up to \$250,000, 11 supervised release of three years, and a special assessment 12 of \$100. 13 THE COURT: Do you understand that those are the 14 maximum penalties; that is, if you go to the statute book 15 and look for the maximum penalties, that's what you'd find? 16 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 17 THE COURT: I don't want to know anything about the 18 details. Have you ever been convicted of a crime previously? 19 THE DEFENDANT: No, sir. 20 THE COURT: All right. Do you understand that this 21 is a felony crime. Conviction of a felony carries with 22 it certain civil or what lawyers would say "collateral consequences" that may affect a person's civil rights: 23

right to vote, the right to serve on a jury, and related to

the offense, the right to possess a firearm or ammunition

24

2.5

1 of any kind. 2 Do you understand that that's a consequence as well? 3 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 4 THE COURT: Mr. Budreau, have you looked at the 5 sentencing quidelines? 6 MR. BUDREAU: I have, your Honor. 7 THE COURT: Have you discussed it with the 8 government? 9 MR. BUDREAU: I have, your Honor. We both concur it 10 would be in the 18- to 24-month range. 11 THE COURT: 18 to 24 months? 12 MR. BUDREAU: Correct. 13 THE COURT: Ms. Rollins, the government agrees with 14 that? 15 MS. ROLLINS: We do, your Honor. 16 THE COURT: In that case it may not be necessary 17 for me to explain in any length since it appears that the 18 sentencing guidelines aren't an issue. 19 MR. BUDREAU: I would agree, your Honor. 20 THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Correia, let me explain that 21 the guidelines that the lawyers are referring to are the 22 recommended sentencing range that a commission appointed 23 by Congress years and years ago had issued in terms of 24 recommendations to judges about what judges should, in 2.5 the eyes of the commission, do or not do in matters of

sentencing.

2.0

2.5

There was a time five or six years ago that a judge would have told you that the guidelines were pretty much mandatory within the circumstances of the case. Given recent developments in Supreme Court law, that's no longer true. The guidelines are, as the term implies, advisory; that is, a judge is to look to them, and if the judge finds that the result under the sentencing guidelines is reasonable, the judge should sentence within that range.

If the judge on the other hand finds that it's an unreasonable recommendation, in that the sentence should be greater or lesser than the range than the guidelines prescribe, the judge is empowered to use his or her discretion and impose the sentence that seems appropriate.

Where here there's an agreement between your counsel and the government, that's an 18- to 24-month sentencing range is the one that the guidelines recommend, what I can tell you is that I would not exceed the 24-month maximum without giving you the chance to first withdraw your plea.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Okay. But other than that assurance, the likelihood of the sentence falling within that range is pretty good; although, we won't know until we see the presentence report.

Again, do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: All right. Do you understand that when you plead guilty, you give up the right to have your case tried before a jury?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Have you ever seen a jury trial?

THE DEFENDANT: No, sir.

THE COURT: Okay. Let me explain that under the U.S. Constitution while judges are given great deal of authority over matters of law binding determinations of fact, for example, whether a person is guilty or not guilty of a crime, if either the defendant or the government insists on it may not be found by the judge but by a panel of citizens, 12 in number, called the jury.

The jury in federal cases is selected from citizens of the United States who live in the eastern part of the state, and the same jurors basically who would appear in the state county courts for trial, it's just that we draw from a larger geographic area, but we chose the same jurors in choosing our juries.

On the day a case is scheduled for trial those designated, picked randomly by computer, are instructed to appear here in the courtroom. When they do, they're interviewed, mostly by the judge but the lawyers participate

as well, to determine their eligibility to sit on the case to be tried.

During the process of choosing the 12, a defendant is permitted to object to any 10 for whatever reason he does not want seated while the government can object to any 6 that it for whatever reason does not want to serve on the jury that's being composed. The jury, after they hear the evidence, are required to be unanimous as to whether the person has or has not committed the offense being tried.

So do you understand that by giving up the right to have your case tried before a jury I mean not only the right to have a jury make the determination as to whether, in fact, you are guilty or not guilty of this offense, but also the right to participate in the selection of the very jury that would make that decision. Is that all clear?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

2.5

THE COURT: Do you understand that you would be entitled to Mr. Budreau's assistance throughout the jury selection process and throughout the trial of the case?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand that I would instruct the jury that they must presume you innocent unless and until the government succeeds in proving your guilt beyond a reasonable doubt?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

1 THE COURT: Do you understand that the burden of 2 proof in a criminal trial is proof beyond a reasonable doubt, 3 a very heavy burden that the government bears throughout the 4 trial? THE DEFENDANT: 5 Yeah. 6 THE COURT: Do you understand that in practical 7 terms because the burden of proof rests with the government 8 you would have no obligation to prove your innocence, to call any witnesses, to produce any evidence, nor certainly 9 could you ever be compelled to testify at trial? 10 11 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 12 Do you also understand that by pleading THE COURT: 13 quilty you give up the right to testify before the jury in your own defense to offer evidence that you think might be 14 15 exculpatory or mitigating? 16 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 17 THE COURT: Do you understand that you give up the 18 right to confront the witnesses against you; that means that 19 Mr. Budreau can ask questions of the government's witnesses? 20 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 21 THE COURT: And do you understand you give up the 22 right to remain silent at least for purposes of today's 23 proceeding? 24 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 2.5 THE COURT: Let me ask the prosecutor to summarize

the evidence that she would present if the case proceeded to trial. When she finishes, I have to ask if you agree that you did the things, the important things, that she alleges.

By "important things," I mean not details, I mean those things that make up the proof of the elements of the crime charged.

All right. Ms. Rollins?

MS. ROLLINS: Yes, your Honor. ATF used a cooperating witness to make several controlled purchases of firearms from Mr. Timothy Correia. There were six transactions total, your Honor, and seven guns in all that were purchased from him. In each instance the government would prove that the cooperating witness called Mr. Timothy Correia, placed an order, agreed on a meeting location and a price. The cooperating witness was then searched and equipped with a recording device, given ATF funds, your Honor, surveyed during the transaction, and immediately debriefed after the transaction, and stripped of any firearms and ammunition or extra ATF funds that were actually purchased from Mr. Correia or left over as a result of the transaction.

In each of the instances, your Honor, that I'm about to describe those series of events occurred. The government would prove that on July 13th, 2010, the cooperating witness contacted Timothy Correia, Olivio Correia, his brother,

who's also charged in the same indictment, was seen in the surveillance video during this transaction in the purchase of a Walther .380 caliber semiautomatic pistol with an obliterated serial number and an Uberti gun as well.

On July 22, 2010, the government would prove that the cooperating witness contacted Timothy Correia and purchased a Cobra semiautomatic pistol. The government would prove that on August 4th, 2010, your Honor, the cooperating witness purchased a Rugger .357 caliber revolver from Mr. Timothy Correia.

The government would prove that on August 9th, 2010, the cooperating witness purchased from Mr. Timothy Correia a Mossberg .12 gauge sawed-off shotgun. On August 11th, 2010, the government would prove that the cooperating witness contacted Mr. Timothy Correia. Mr. Timothy Correia did not arrive; he sent his brother, Olivio Correia, who then showed up and sold the cooperating witness a Smith & Wesson .38 caliber revolver.

Mr. Correia was not seen, Timothy was not seen in any video on that day, but there were calls placed to him to set up that transaction.

The government finally, your Honor, would prove that on November 29, 2010, the cooperating witness contacted Timothy Correia and purchased a Jimenez .380 caliber semiautomatic pistol.

Your Honor, the government would also prove that during all relevant time periods discussed between July and November of 2010 Timothy Correia did not have a federal firearms license. The government would prove that all guns mentioned traveled in interstate and/or foreign commerce, and the government would be able to prove that all of the guns were firearms.

Lastly, your Honor, there is a forfeiture allegation but because of the fact that the government seized all of the weapons and ammunition at the end of the transaction, there's nothing to forfeit at this time. That's what the government would be proving.

and the offer of evidence is that on the dates specified you sold seven firearms either directly yourself or working with your brother to a person who you obviously didn't know was a cooperating government witness, and that at no time during any one of these transactions did you have a firearm dealer's license. Is that true? Do you accept responsibility for the offenses as alleged?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Are you offering to plead guilty

willingly, freely, and voluntarily?

2.0

2.5

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Has anyone coerced you in a physical

```
1
       sense into pleading guilty?
 2
               THE DEFENDANT: No, sir.
 3
               THE COURT: Have any secret promises been made to
 4
       induce you to plead guilty?
 5
               THE DEFENDANT: No, sir.
 6
               THE COURT: Have any threats been made other than
 7
       obviously the threat of being prosecuted?
 8
               THE DEFENDANT: No, sir.
 9
               THE COURT: Have you had sufficient time to discuss
10
       with Mr. Bourbeau (sic) the charge in the case, your rights,
11
       your possible defenses, and the consequences of pleading
12
       quilty?
13
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.
14
               MR. BUDREAU: Your Honor, I smile a little bit
15
      because people confuse me often with Mike Bourbeau.
16
               THE COURT: I'm sorry.
17
               MR. BUDREAU: That happens often.
18
               THE COURT: No, I'm sorry.
19
               MR. BUDREAU: I'm better looking I have to say.
20
               MS. ROLLINS: I object to that.
21
               THE COURT: That is exactly what I was thinking,
22
      Mr. Budreau. I'm sorry.
23
           Do you feel that at all times he's acted in your best
24
       interests?
25
               THE DEFENDANT:
                               Yes, sir.
```

THE COURT: Mr. Correia, have I confused you by anything I've said or any question I've asked?

THE DEFENDANT: No, sir.

THE COURT: Do you understand that you're pleading guilty because you are guilty and given the strength of the government's evidence you feel it's in your best interests to plead guilty?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

2.5

THE COURT: Does counsel have any other areas you'd like me to inquire into?

MS. ROLLINS: No your Honor.

MR. BUDREAU: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Correia, if you'd step back to the counsel table with Mr. Budreau, please.

All right. I find Mr. Correia is well-oriented, that his answers have been responsive to my questions. I find that he understands the nature of the charge and the potential penalties that he faces. I find that he is competent to enter a plea; that he has done so with the full understanding of his rights, and the consequences of waving those rights. I also find that there is a sufficient basis in the facts alleged by the government as acknowledged by the defendant to warrant a finding of guilt on the offense beyond a reasonable doubt and so I find that the plea is entered voluntarily, with full knowledge of its consequences, and after careful

```
consideration by the defendant and advice of experienced
 1
 2
       counsel of his own best interests, I will accept the plea,
 3
       and we will schedule sentencing for November 17, 2011, at
 4
       3 p.m.
 5
           All right. If counsel have nothing further on this
       matter today, we will be recessing.
 6
 7
               MS. COLLINS: No, your Honor.
               MR. BUDREAU: No, your Honor. Thank you.
 8
 9
               THE CLERK: All rise.
10
               (Whereupon, the proceedings concluded at 11:25 a.m.)
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

1	<u>CERTIFICATE</u>
2	
3	I, Helana E. Kline, a Registered Merit Reporter,
4	Certified Realtime Reporter, and Federal Official Court
5	Reporter of the United States District Court, do hereby
6	certify that the foregoing transcript, from Page 1 to
7	Page 20, constitutes, to the best of my skill and ability,
8	a true and accurate transcription of my stenotype notes
9	taken in the matter of the United States of America v.
0	Timothy Correia, et al.
L1	
L2	
L3	
L 4	
L5	
L 6	
L7	
8	
9	
20	
21	
22	/s/ Helana E. Kline November 28, 2011
23	Helana E. Kline, RMR, CRR
24	Federal Official Court Reporter
25	